MSLIN-98-001





4/Eslection
sheresa
1-15-99

January 5, 1999

To: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Attn: Art Unit 2811 - A. WILLIAMS

From: George O. Saile, Reg. No. 19,572

20 McIntosh Drive

GROUP 2100

**RECEIVED** 

JAN 1 2 1999

Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 12603

Subject:

M.S. Lin

WAFER SCALE PACKING SCHEME

\_\_Art Group: 2811

A. WILLIAMS

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

This is in response to the Restriction or Election Requirement in the Office Action dated 12/15/98. In that Office Action, restriction was required to one of two stated

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on January 5, 1999.

Stephen B Ackerman Reg.# 37761 Signature/Date Jan. 5 1797

Inventions under 35 U.S.C. 121. The Inventions stated are Group I - Claims 31-36 to a semiconductor device, classified in Class 257, subclass 734 and Group II - Claims 1-30 to a process, classified in Class 438, subclass 14+.

Applicant provisionally elects to be examined the Invention described by the Examiner as Group II - Claims 1-30 drawn to a process classified in Class 438, subclass 14+. This election is made with traverse of the requirement under 37 C.F.R.1.143 for the reasons given in the following paragraphs.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the Requirement for Restriction given in the Office Action. The Examiner gives the reason for the distinctness of the two inventions as (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different products or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP 806.05(f). However, upon reading the product Claims against the process Claims one can readily see that the product Claims are directed to "A wafer scale package", and the process Claims are directed to "A process for wafer scale packaging", it is necessary to obtain claims in both the product and method claim language. The method Claims necessarily use the product and vice versa. The field of search must necessarily cover both the method

25 1 1 L

class/subclass 438/14+ and products class 257/734 in addition to other related Classes and subclasses to provide a complete and adequate search. The fields of search for the Group I and Group II inventions are clearly and necessarily coextensive. The Examiner's suggestion that "the device of the group I invention could be made by processes materially different than that of the group II invention, for example, in claim 19 instead of forming the device by electroless plating, it can be performed by screen printing", is very speculative and really has nothing to do with the Claims as presented in this Patent Application. Further, it is respectfully suggested that these reasons are insufficient to place the additional cost of a second Patent Application upon the Applicants. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this restriction requirement for these reasons.

Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement and the Allowance of the present Patent Application is requested.

Sincerely,

Stephen B. Ackerman,

Reg. #37761